

**REMARKS***Regarding Claim Status*

Claims 1-15 and 18-32 were pending. Claims 1-15 and 18-32 were finally rejected. In  
5 accordance with a telephonic conversation between the undersigned and the Supervisory  
Patent Examiner, John G. Weiss, on February 28, 2005, claim 1 is specifically amended  
herein to place the present application in a condition for allowance. No new matter is  
introduced. By this Amendment, claims 1-15 and 18-32 are pending. Applicants thank Mr.  
Weiss for his time and direction in moving the present application forward to allowance.

10

*Regarding Claim Objections*

Claims 1-15, 18-29 and 31 were objected to because of the alleged informalities in the phrase  
“determining [a] local content grouping near each title extracted.” However, the objections  
15 were made not based on the formality of the claim language, but the interpretation thereof.  
The objections were therefore improper and should be withdrawn. Please see the  
Specification and the previous Reply for the proper interpretation of this phrase.

20 *Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections*

Claims 1, 5-11, 13-14, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
unpatentable over Baker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,338,067, hereinafter referred to as “Baker”) in  
view of Wical (U.S. Pat. No. 6,061,675). Claims 2-4, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35  
U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Wical in view of Johnson et al. (U.S.  
25 Pat. No. 6,553,385, hereinafter referred to as “Johnson”). Claims 12 and 18-24 were rejected  
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Wical in view of Lawrence et  
al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,289,342, hereinafter referred to as “Lawrence”). Claim 15 was rejected  
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Wical in view of  
Maddalozzo, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,460,060, hereinafter referred to as “Maddalozzo”).  
30 Claims 25-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Baker and Wical in view of Yong (U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,606). Claim 27 was rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, Wical, and Maddalo in view of Yong.

5 All of the above-cited references and their various combinations had been cited in the previous Office Actions. Applicants have duly presented counter arguments why these prior inventions, especially Baker and Wical, individually and in various combinations, do not teach or suggest the invention as set forth in the claims. These prior arguments are incorporated herein by reference.

10 The same arguments were also communicated in part to the Supervisory Patent Examiner, John G. Weiss, during the aforementioned telephonic conversation. **Applicants agree with Mr. Weiss's analysis that there is no proper motivation to combine Baker and Wical.** Accordingly, all pending claims 1-15 and 18-32 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


15

*Conclusion*

The Examiner is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-331-8413 for **clarification or any suggested actions** such as an Examiner's Amendment to accelerate prosecution and forward the present application to allowance.

20

Respectfully submitted,



Katharina Wang Schuster, Reg. No. 50,000  
Attorney for the Applicants

LUMEN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SERVICES  
2345 Yale Street, Second Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
(O) 650-424-0100 x 8413 (F) 650-424-0141